



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/802,857

03/12/2001

Akihiko Koh

SON-2047

3304

23353

7590

05/22/2006

RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

YIGDALL, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2192

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20060516


DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The Reply Brief filed on March 8, 2006 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

It is noted that the issues in the Reply Brief appear to be presented now with different annotations than in the Appeal Brief filed on January 13, 2006, which issues were already addressed in the Examiner's Answer mailed on February 6, 2006. For example, Appellant's arguments with respect to the plurality of coincidence signals (Reply Brief, page 3) were addressed at page 5 of the Examiner's Answer, and Appellant's arguments with respect to the interrupt control circuit and switch of Sagane (page 4) were addressed at pages 9-10 of the Answer. Likewise, Appellant's arguments with respect to where and how the CPU receives the coincidence signals (page 4) were addressed at pages 6-8 of the Answer.


TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

MY

Michael J. Yigdall
Examiner
Art Unit 2192